# City of Falls Church

14 D		1.01	4 1 37	
Meeting Date:	An Ordinance to Amo	-	Agenda No.:	
June 26, 2006	Zoning, and Chapter		10 (d) (1)	
	the Code of the City of			
	Virginia by amending	g and reenacting		
	Section 38-2 Definition	ons; Sections 38-16,		
	R1-A, Low Density F	Residential District		
	and 38-17, R1-B, Me	dium Density		
	Residential District; 3	88-28, Height, Lot		
	and Yard Regulations	s; and 31-11,		
	Subdivisions, Genera	l Regulations; in		
	order to revise single-	-family residential		
	development regulation	ons by clarifying		
	height measurement a	and house orientation		
	regulations and by str	engthening pipestem		
	lot, substandard lot as	nd subdivision review		
	regulations (TO6-11)			
Proposed Motion Move First Reading, refer to Boards and Commissions, and				
Schedule Second Reading for August 14, 2006				
Originating Dept. Head:		Disposition by Counc	zil:	
Elizabeth Friel, GM, Development				
703.248.5182				
ERF				
CFO:	City Attorney:	City Manager:		
John Tuohy	Roy Thorpe, Jr.	Daniel McKeever		
703.248.5092	703.248.5010	703.248.5001		
JHT 6/22/2006	RBT 6/22/06	<b>FWS for DEM</b>		

### **SUMMARY**:

 This legislation would revise and strengthen residential regulations in the City in the following areas:

- □ **HEIGHT** Revise how building height is measured, to disallow dispropotionate height for new single-family homes.
- □ **ORIENTATION** Clarify that houses side, front and rear setbacks match the side, front and rear orientation of homes.
- □ **PIPESTEMS** Add regulations that limit the number of new pipestem lots to 2 from an existing lot.
- □ SUBSTANDARDS- Clarify the intent of substandard lot section to insure that contiguous substandard lots under common ownership are required to be combined to conforming lots.
- □ **SUBDIVISIONS** Require additional information on subdivision plats.

## **BACKGROUND:**

- **OVERALL:**
- The 1997 and 2005 Comprehensive Plan contain a number of goals and strategies to be implemented to address the environmental and compatibility impacts of new residential

infill development. Over the past several years, the City Council and Planning Commission have discussed, researched and analyzed tools for addressing Residential Infill. This package of code changes has been recommended by the Planning Commission's Zoning Ordinance Review Subcommittee (ZORS) in April 2006 and also reviewed in detail in worksession format by the Planning Commission and City Council over the past 30 days. The City Council and Planning Commission together came to consensus on May 30, 2006 that these items should move forward to First Reading. Please see each item discussed in detail below.

**HEIGHT**:

## Background:

Our current Code has allowed 35 feet of height in single-family neighborhoods since the Zoning Code was first adopted in 1959. However, much of the City's single-family homes were built in the 1940's and 1950's and many of these as 1 or 11/2 story cape cods or rambler style homes. When single family home redevelopment, particularly teardowns, began in earnest in the late 1990's neighborhoods were impacted as new 35 foot homes were built in neighborhoods of 1-½ story homes.

Although 35 feet is the "industry standard" and typical for a single family home, our Code actually allows more height than that in some circumstances. One issue is that the height can be measured from the curb or an average grade around the house site; whichever is higher (see attached graphic). A second issue is that the current Code is not specific as to whether pre-development grade or post-development grade is to be utilized for the baseline. The "more than 35" houses that result particularly overwhelm their neighbors. This Code change will eliminate this possibility.

The City's 2005 Comprehensive Plan contains several goals that refer to the protection of the character of residential neighborhoods and specifically related to infill development. The City's 2001 Adopted Design Guidelines discuss height. These guidelines suggest that the height of existing neighborhoods should be considered when new buildings are introduced.

#### Code Change:

It is recommended the Code be revised to allow less variation in height based on changed grades, curbs or slopes. In this Code change, height is measured based on average natural (pre-development) grade and no curb height is considered. The changes also take out the "whatever is higher" caveat. See the proposed Code language that includes new and revised definitions regarding grade and height, below at Line 234-264.

HOUSE ORIENTATION:

#### Background:

The City's current Code does not specify that the front of the house needs to face the street or the front setback. While it would seem logical that house orientation match setbacks, there is actually a long precedent to allow variation in orientation from what is expected. The issue is that neighbors are greatly impacted when orientation varies. For example, when the rear of a new house is actually oriented toward its side yard and the side yard of the neighbors, the side yard becomes a rear yard activity area within 10' to

15' of existing house. The new house's back door, back deck or patio and associated noise all impact their neighbor in the area that is meant to be a side yard with very little activity. The setback and yard designations required by the Code are meant to provide appropriate distance and privacy between neighbors. The Code change would simply specify that front, side and rear setbacks equate to front, and side and rear house orientation.

The City's 2005 Adopted Comprehensive Plan contains several goals that call for residential infill development to be reviewed and addressed through Code changes. House orientation is also mention in the City's 2001 Adopted Design Guidelines with a policy goal that states "Orient the façade of new construction in the same direction as adjacent buildings".

## Code Change:

As described above, see the proposed Code language below at Lines 284-287 and Lines 305-308.

#### **PIPESTEM LOTS:**

## Background:

Pipestem lots are accessed through a minimum of a fifteen (15) feet "pipestem" driveway, which allows lots to be configured in a stacking pattern in the R1-A and R1-B Single Family Zoning Districts. Increasingly pipestem lots seem developed in a manner that is intrusive to the City's development pattern. These impacts are increased greatly when a new pipestem "neighborhood" of 3 or more lots is introduced in an existing neighborhood.

The City's 2005 Adopted Comprehensive Plan contains several goals that call for pipestem lot development in particular to be reviewed and addressed through Code changes. The City's 2001 Adopted Design Guidelines state that new residential development sites should reflect the general arrangement of existing lots on the street.

#### Code Change:

The proposed code amendment will limit the number of pipestems to 2 from any existing parcel. (See the proposed Code language below at Lines 279 and 301). Please note that new height and house orientation revisions will also effectively mitigate the negative impacts of pipestem development. The changes proposed for impervious and lot coverage will apply to pipestem lots as well in an equitable manner (see T06-12) Finally, an enhanced subdivision process will impact all new lots going through the subdivision process. The new information on subdivision plats will be particularly useful for pipestems, with their unique impacts. See the proposed Code language below at Lines 356-373.

### **SUBSTANDARD LOTS:**

### Background:

- When much of the City was subdivided in the 1940s, a number of small lots, some as
- small as 3000 square feet were created. Most residents bought 2 or more lots and built a single home over those lots. However, when the first Zoning Ordinance was adopted
- in1959, two single-family zoning districts were established with larger required lot

sizes. These regulations, R1-A and R1B, have been unchanged for the past 40 years. The R1-A District requires a minimum lot size of eleven thousand two hundred fifty (11,250) square feet and the R1-B District requires a minimum lot size of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet. Approximately one-third of all R1-A lots are substandard and approximately one-quarter of all R1-B lots are substandard per these regulations.

The current Code says that any lot created before 1944 can be built upon provided it is in an R district or cannot be "reasonably combined" with other property to meet the minimum requirement. The Code's intent is to allow the single lot, single home property owners to have continued development rights on their lot. However, in some cases, several substandard lots are under common ownership with an existing house built over these lots. These lots could be "reasonably combined" to create a conforming lot or lots prior to redevelopment. However, if the owner sells off the lots before the City is involved, there is no mechanism for the City to prevent this private transaction. Further, the development that occurs on these lots is increasingly incompatible with the City's neighborhood's development pattern and these homes are often the ones that cause neighborhood complaints.

The City's 2005 Comprehensive Plan contains goals and strategies that support restricting the development of substandard lots. Goal 1.C states, "Promote compatibility with existing neighborhoods, improvement of the existing housing stock, and environmental preservation in relation to infill residential development." The Plan also has a recommended action that states that the City should consider revisions to the zoning ordinance regarding building coverage, impervious coverage, and substandard lots.

#### Code Change:

Staff has found that the Cities of Chesapeake Suffolk, Norfolk, Hampton, Newport News, Alexandria, and Virginia Beach, all have similar Code language. Each of these cities had Code language like the City of Falls Church's current language, but felt compelled to strengthen and clarify the underlying language.

Staff had been suggesting an option similar to Chesapeake's, which "merged" substandard lots under common ownership. Specifically, the language stated "Contiguous lots under the same ownership that have a lot width of less than 40' shall be considered merged into one lot as of February 22, 2006". In further discussions, staff found that this language that sets a date in time as a trigger might be problematic for enforcement. This is particularly true because the City's deed records are kept in both Fairfax and Arlington Counties and discrepancies have been found in the various tax maps that reflect lot lines for the City. Staff felt that a simple explanation of what was and was not permitted, written as Code, would work better.

Staff found language in the Virginia Beach Code that addresses this concern and used it as a base model for the new language. The proposed code language requires owners of lots that are substandard, who also own lots adjacent to those lots, to combine them to meet the minimum lot size of the district. This is applicable to substandard lots adjacent

- to other lots in common ownership and substandard lots adjacent to standard lots under common ownership.
- Also note that new height as well and house orientation revisions will effectively
- 168 mitigate the negative impacts of substandard lot development. The changes proposed
- 169 for impervious and lot coverage will apply to substandard lots in a proportional manner
- 170 (see T06-12) See the proposed Code language below at Lines 315-345.

171172

173

- **SUBDIVISION REVIEW:**
- Background:
- 174 The Planning Commission's subdivision process and requirements are limited to
- 175 reviewing the most basic Code requirements. The Planning Commission holds a public
- hearing for new subdivisions, but the information provided to them and to the public is
- 177 limited. The neighbors have little influence or information when they attend the public
- hearings for new subdivisions. Additional information about the development would
- enable the Planning Commission and public to provide more direction to applicants
- about infill development and thereby reduce some of the negative impacts.

181 182

183 184

185

Code Change:

- The addition of house orientation, tree preservation, and the possibility of more vegetative screening for adjacent properties will enable the Planning Commission and the public to provide input on the context of the new homes and affect the impact of
- 186 those new properties on the existing neighborhoods. See the proposed Code language
- below at Lines 355-372 for this new language.

188 189

190

191 192

193

194

195 196

197

198

- **TIMING**: Routine, as detailed below
  - □ June 26 –City Council Public Hearing and 1<sup>st</sup> reading
  - □ June 29 and July 6-Run Legal Ads for Planning Commission Public Hearing.
  - □ July 7 Notify Property Owners (All those impacted by pipestem and substandard changes)
  - □ July 11 Special Planning Commission Worksession
  - □ July 17-Planning Commission Public Hearing
  - □ July 20 and July 27 –Run Legal ads for City Council Second Reading
  - □ August 14, 2006 City Council Public Hearing and 2nd Reading

199 200

201202

203204

205206

207 208

209210

211 212

010	
213	(TO( 11)
<ul><li>214</li><li>215</li></ul>	(TO6-11)
216	AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 38, ZONING, AND CHAPTER
217	31, SUBDIVISIONS, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF FALLS
	CHURCH, VIRGINIA BY AMENDING AND REENACTING SECTION
<ul><li>218</li><li>219</li></ul>	38-2 DEFINITIONS; SECTIONS 38-16, R1-A, LOW DENSITY
220	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND 38-17, R1-B, MEDIUM DENSITY
	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND 58-17, RI-B, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; 38-28, HEIGHT, LOT AND YARD
221	REGULATIONS; AND 31-11, SUBDIVISIONS, GENERAL
<ul><li>222</li><li>223</li></ul>	
	REGULATIONS; IN ORDER TO REVISE SINGLE-FAMILY
224	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS BY CLARIFYING
225	HEIGHT MEASUREMENT AND HOUSE ORIENTATION
226	REGULATIONS AND BY STRENGTHENING PIPESTEM LOT,
227	SUBSTANDARD LOT AND SUBDIVISION REVIEW REGULATIONS
228	
229	
230	Section 38-2, Definitions
231	(a)-(c)
232	"Accessory Dwelling Unit"- "Building Capacity" definitions
233	D.::13: E4::-4. Th
234	Building Footprint: The surface area occupied by a building, expressed in
235	square feet.
236	"D-11- 11- 2" "C - 1- I1" 1-f'-'C
237	"Bulk plane"- "Grade Level" definitions
238	
239	Grade Level, Finished: The grade level immediately adjacent to the
240	building footprint not otherwise deemed to be the Natural Grade Level.
241	Finished Grade shall include ground disturbance subject to a grading plan
242	or that serves to increase allowable building height.
243	Crede Level Network The ground level immediately ediscout to the
244	Grade Level, Natural: The ground level immediately adjacent to the
245	building footprint, with no adjustment having been made to the existing
246	undisturbed ground level. Natural Grade may include minor ground
247	disturbances associated with landscaping, repairs to existing structures as
248	required by the building official, or other incidental grade adjustments that
249	do not serve to allow an increase in the height of an existing building or that
250	would otherwise be possible prior to the ground disturbance.
251	"Cross Cits Area" "Hodge" definitions
252	"Gross Site Area" – "Hedge" definitions
253	Height of a building (in fact). The wantical distance from the actablished
254	Height of a building (in feet). The vertical distance from the established
255	curb line, or from the average grade level at the building line if higher, to
256	the highest point of the coping of a flat roof, or the deck line of a mansard
257	roof, or the mean height level between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. (See Illustration 3.)
258	<del>22HDFCI FOOIS. (500 HUSLF2HOR 5.)</del>

260 Height of a building (in feet): The vertical distance measured from the 261 average grade of the building footprint to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof, or the deck line of a mansard roof, or the mean height level 262 263 between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. Average grade shall be determined using the finished grade level or the natural grade level, 264 whichever is lower. 265 266 267 "Height of a Building in stories"- "Yard, Side" definitions. 268 269 Sec. 38-16. R-1A, low-density residential district. 270 (a)-(d)...271 (e) Conditions applying to permitted uses 272 Minimum lot area. (1) 273 a. For one-family dwellings, eleven thousand two hundred fifty 274 (11,250) square feet. For a pipestem lot, the minimum required lot 275 area shall be calculated by excluding any portion of the lot between 276 the front lot line and the building setback line which is less than 277 thirty (30) feet in width, the width being determined by a line which is perpendicular to any side lot line. Only two (2) pipestem lots 278 shall be permitted to be subdivided from any individual parcel. 279 280 281 (2) Minimum lot width Minimum yard requirements 282 (3) 283 d. One-family dwellings shall be located so that the front of the 284 285 dwelling is oriented toward the front setback and street; the side of the dwelling toward the side setback and the rear of the 286 dwelling toward the rear setback. 287 288 (4)-(7)289 290 291 Section 38-17, R-1 B, Medium Density Residential 292 293 (e) Conditions applying to permitted uses 294 Minimum lot area. (1) 295 a. For one-family dwellings, seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet. For a pipestem lot, the minimum required lot area shall 296 297 be calculated by excluding any portion of the lot between the front 298 lot line and the building setback line which is less than thirty (30) feet in width, the width being determined by a line which is 299 perpendicular to any side lot line. Only two (2) pipestem lots shall 300 be permitted to be subdivided from any individual parcel. 301 Minimum lot width 302 (2) Minimum yard requirements 303 (3) 304 305 e. One-family dwellings shall be located so that the front of the dwelling is oriented toward the front setback and street; the side 306

307	of the dwelling toward the side setback and the rear of the
308	dwelling toward the rear setback.
309	(4)-(7)
310	
311	38-28, Height, lot and yard requirements
312	(a)
313	(b) Additional requirements, exceptions and modifications
314	(1)
315	(2) Substandard lots.
316	<b>a.</b> Any lot of official record as of February 14, 1944, or any lot
317	of a subdivision approved by the city from February 14, 1944, to
318	the effective date of this chapter, which does not meet the lot size
319	requirements for the district in which it is located, may be used
320	for a one-family dwelling, provided it is in an "R" District;
321	however,
322	a. It is in an "R" District and
323	b. It cannot reasonably be combined with other property to
324	meet the minimum requirements.
325 326	b. If the owner of a lot which does not meet the minimum
327	requirements of the R1-A or R1B Residential Districts is the owner of or becomes the owner of another
328	substandard lot adjacent to it, he is not entitled to
329	development rights as described in (a) above. In this
330	instance, the owner of the two (2) or more adjacent
331	substandard lots must combine the two (2) or more lots to
332	form one which will meet the area requirements of the
333	ordinance applicable within the R-1A and R-1B
334	Residential Districts.
225	The expense of continuous substandard lets is prohibited
335 336	c. The owner of contiguous substandard lots is prohibited from conveying one or more of the substandard lots with
337	the result that both the grantors and the grantee possess
338	development rights as described in (a) above.
330	
339	d. Status as a single and separate owner may not be acquired
340	after enactment of this ordinance by selling a parcel and
341	reducing the remainder below the minimum lot
342	requirements nor may an owner of several contiguous
343	nonconforming parcels combine them so as to leave a
344	substandard lot, and assert development rights as
345	described in (a) above.
346	
347	Con 21 11 Subdivisions Conoral Decadetions
348 349	Sec. 31-11, Subdivisions, General Regulations.  The following shall be considered minimum requirements and shall be varied.
350	The following shall be considered minimum requirements and shall be varied only for specific reasons, stated of record by the planning commission in
351	connection with the final approval of the plat to which related:
352	
<i>332</i>	(a)-(c)

353 Building sites. Building sites shall have frontage on existing or recorded public streets and shall have the dimensions and areas in the provisions of this 354 355 code relative to zoning. Orientation of houses shall be shown for all new lots. 356 (e) ... Street layout. Streets shall be provided to give access to adjoining 357 (f) 358 acreage and to connect with the principal streets in adjoining subdivisions or to 359 connect with existing or proposed streets, as determined by the planning 360 commission. Reserve strips intended to protect the use of dead end and 361 boundary streets are prohibited. Cul-de-sac streets shall not exceed four hundred 362 (400) feet in length and shall be provided with a turn-around with a minimum right-of-way radius of fifty (50) feet. Blocks in general shall not be longer than 363 364 one thousand (1,000) feet between street intersections unless warranted by some 365 unusual condition. Only two new pipestem lots shall be permitted to be subdivided from any existing lot. 366 367 (g)-(h) ... 368 Trees. Whenever deemed necessary by the planning commission, street (i) 369 trees and/or additional screening, shall be planted in such locations as may be 370 designated by the director of public works and the trees shall be of sizes and 371 types approved by him. All trees to be preserved shall be shown on the final 372 plat. 373 374 375 376 1st Reading: 6-26-06

377

378

379

2nd Reading:

(TO6-11)

Adoption: \_\_\_\_\_